

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED	NVENTOR	AT	TORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/426,644	10/25/99	MOON		J 13	49.1022/MD
-		,, b, d, d,, ,, ,,,	コ	EXAMINER	
021171. STAAS & HALS	QM12/0927		TUGBANG.D		
700 11TH STR		•		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 500 NASHINGTON D	C 20001			3729 M DATE MAILED: 09/27/01	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/426,644	MOON ET AL.	
rancery reach	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dexter Tugbang	3729	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cov r sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 September 2001 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the control of	cation. A proper rep chiplaces the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extended the final Office action: or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \(\square\) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 13-16 and 24.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,17,19,23,27,30,31,38,40,42,44</u>	<u>,45 and 47</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 46.			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp	proved by the Exam	niner.
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	1	PLEE YOUNG	
	3UPER\	VISORY PATENT EX	KAMINEH R 3700
S. Patent and Trademark Office	TEC	HINOLOGIOGIA	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Attachment to Advisory Action

Regarding the merits of the AAPA and Leban, the applicants continue to allege that neither teaches forming multiple fluid jetting apparatuses. The examiner most respectfully traverses because the limitations requiring the plurality of fluid jetting apparatuses in each of Claims 1, 17, 27, 31 and 45 (i.e. "to form the fluid jetting apparatuses") are very broad and relative limitations. Clearly, the examiner and the applicants agree that the AAPA and Leban teach forming multiple fluid jetting apparatuses in a piece-by-piece relationship. However, the limitations in each of Claims 1, 17, 27, 31 and 45 do not exclude the multiple fluid jetting apparatuses from being formed from any such piece-by-piece relationship. Moreover, the claims do not recite as to how each of the recited steps in Claims 1, 17, 27, 31 and 45 forms multiple fluid jetting apparatuses. As such, the AAPA and Leban fully satisfy the limitations of "to form the fluid jetting apparatuses". Although at this point, this may raise new issues, perhaps further limitations as to how the steps form multiple fluid jetting apparatuses may avoid the AAPA and Leban. Therefore, the applicants' arguments have not been deemed to found persuasive and the examiner maintains the Final Rejection (in Paper No. 12).